109585

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION III
841 Chestnut Building
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

SUBJECT: C & D Recycling Site
Field Report - 4/3/89

DATE: APR 06 1989

FROM: Michael Towle, Hydrogeologist MT.
PA CERCLA Remedial Enforcement

PFE

TO: File

On April 3, 1989 I witnessed the well and tap sampling at the Sulima residence. The sampling was conducted by HART Associates, Inc. while Representatives from local t.v. and newspapers also witnessed and recorded much of the actual sampling. It was apparent that Jane and Tom Sulima did not expect a representative from EPA. A chronology of events follows:

TIME (min.)	Event
0 (1:08)	BEGIN TO DISCHARGE INTO SINK IN THE BASEMENT OF THE HOUSE. The discharge is coming from a tap immediately after the piping from the well as best as I could determine. Temperature is fluctuating between 9.8 and 9.9° C.
6	HART calibrates their pH meter using stock (4.0 and 7.0) from Fisher Scientific. HART explains the calibration to the Sulimas. Mr. Sulima tests each stock with pH paper. After the instrument is calibrated, HART reads the pH of Vinegar (at the request of the Sulimas) as 2.48 and explains that the reading is not entirely accurate because it is out of the calibrated range of 4.0 to 7.0. Mr. Sulima tested the vinegar with pH paper. A temperature reading at this time is 9.8° C.
10	Temperature readings usually show 9.9° C
15	Purge water sampled in small plastic container. pH reading is 4.17.
19	Hart retests the pH of the purge water due to possible interference by the vinegar. The second reading is 4.14.
20	The well is still discharging to the sink at this time.

303901A

TIME (min.)	Event
	Mr. Sulima remarked that the pH papers indicate that the pH of the water is approximately 5.0. EPA confirms this observation, although the color chart does not exactly match the pH paper and my guess would be slighty less that 5.0. EPA requests HART to recalibrate the pH instrument as before.
25	A sample of water is tested. The temperature is observed to be 10.0° C. The pH of the water is 4.2.
29	Purging is completed. HART explains field and trip blanks. HART explains that the bottles had no preservatives. HART explains that the analysis will be for TAL metals and all organics.
32	Conductivity (normalized to 25° C) is .111 mmhos. HART begins to sample the discharge.

At this time I had two discussions with the Sulimas. One concerning the "uniqueness" of artesian wells and 'dry' wells in close proximity. The other discussion implied that it is difficult to get things done quickly at EPA, but the end result was usually worthwhile.

58	UPSTAIRS BATHROOM. Jane Sulima points out the blue powdery substance on the outside of her sink pipes. She also mentions that the pipes are pitted. I notice that the blue substance originates at the pipe fittings and exists on both Hot (much) and Cold (little) piping.
	HART sampling is completed and HART explains that they will preserve the samples before they are shipped.
	I spent the next 2.25 hours talking with Jane Sulima, Tom Sulima and Jeff Cox at the kitchen table. Jeff Cox took little notes and seemed to be falling asleep as I discussed the geology and hydrogeology issues. I read a letter from Jane to Donna McCartney and then discussed the following issues contained in that letter and in the Information Summary.

1. Wind Rose. Jane wants "loci" changed...
2. Dust wipes. Jane wants to know when...
3. Excavation. Jane wants excavation of soil...
4. Sampling for PCP. Jane wants on-site sampling
   CHECK IF THIS HAS BEEN DONE
5. Shallow well. Jane wants it sampled

CHECK. This may be good if not done

6. "negligible".
7. residential wells.
8. artesian fountain-lead insolubility.
9. gravel drain vs. artesian conditions in shale pit.

Jeff Cox appeared interested in the low pH of the well. My speculations were: 1) Environmental; e.g. coal strata, (I mentioned that several wells in area had low pH), and 2) Contamination; e.g. battery acid as a possibility.

Jane seemed generally satisfied with our discussion. We agreed that we could disagree on certain issues. I explained that EPA is not swaying to PRPs or citizens but examining the data to come to an independent conclusion. I left at 4:30 to go to Sharon Rohrbach's house.

Sharon Rohrbach was very disagreeable with any of my explanation or rationale. I found it unfortunate that she was unwilling to listen to any of my explanations.

Sharon & I discussed many issues concerning the site and disagreed on most of them. According to Sharon EPA was wrong and she had 5 experts to prove it. She felt this way even after I explained the rationale for our thinking and mentioned that I could find an equal number of "experts" who agree. The usefulness of dye testing is a good example of a major issue upon which we disagreed.

Several times the discussion was heated and once her daughter asked her mother why she was talking so loudly.

I was unable to write much down due to the pace and tone of our conversation. Sharon's concerns were:

1) The # of monitoring wells is not enough and it should be 20 with the majority of the needed wells on the SE side of the site and beyond the fence line.
2) documentation, QA/QC, tank removal.
3) Green Cards
4) Sampling results - turnaround
5) location of samples, i.e. well or tap.

I departed at 6:45. We did not agree on much, but Sharon did seem to understand that EPA is entitled to form their own opinion concerning the site and its problems which may be accurate, but different than Sharon's opinion.

NOTE: At one time I mistakenly said that a high pb reading in a rock sample from an off-site location is good for background.

Sharon told me I was wrong and why. She said that a citizen should not have to tell EPA what is right. I agreed that I was wrong and attributed it to "being flustered". She recommended that I consider leaving EPA for a different profession.